REMARKS

Claims 63-101 were pending and presented for examination in this application. In an Office Action dated May 22, 2009, claims 63-101 were rejected. Applicants thank the Examiner for examination of the claims pending in this application and address the Examiner's comments below. Based on the above Amendment and the following Remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections, and withdraw them.

Response to Objection to the Specification

The Examiner objected to paragraph [0029] of the specification because the paragraph includes an embedded hyperlink. Applicants addressed this objection in the amendment filed on May 22, 2008The Applicants request the Examiner to refer to the previously filed amendment and withdraw this objection.

Response to Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

In the 5th paragraph of the Office Action, the Examiner rejects claims 63, 65, and 67 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Kobori, et al. (US 4,703,366) in view of Korman, et al (US 6,308,887). Additionally, the Examiner rejects claims 64, 66, 68-101 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Kobori in view of one or more of Korman, Reese, et al. (US 7,298,512), Hymel (US 2003/0220988), Morinaga (US 4,734,898), Katsuo, et al. (US 5,721,883), Krumm (US 6,611,622), and Chino (US 6,118,888).

Claim 63, 78, and 96 recite a printer, method, and computer program product for printing time-based media. Claim 63 is representative of these claims and now recites *inter alia*:

27

the embedded multimedia server **within the printer** for selecting a portion of the monitored streaming media content based on a **plurality of user defined criteria** ...;

These aspects of the invention are not disclosed by Kobori or Korman. Kobori merely discloses a primitive video imaging printer with a freeze command. A user monitors the video on a video monitor and selects the freeze command for a particular image in the video. *See* Kobori, col. 4, ll. 34-42. Consequently, the recording command generating section turns on a recording/reproducing signal until the frozen image is stored in a memory. Kobori, col. 4, ll. 47-65.

The Examiner cites Kobori Figure 2 and 3 and argues that the freeze command and the recording command generating section disclose "a plurality of user defined criteria" for selecting a portion of the monitored streaming media content. The Examiner is incorrect. First, Kobori's freeze command is <u>not</u> **a user defined criterion** for selecting a portion of media content; it is instead a predetermined command initiated by the user any time a user wants to select a frame. Even assuming *arguendo* that Kobori's freeze command could be considered a *user-specified criterion*, the command generating section does not disclose or suggest **a plurality of user defined criteria** because the command generating section is neither user defined, nor criteria (plural). Accordingly, Kobori does not disclose a module within the printer for "selecting a portion of the monitored streaming media content **based on a plurality of user defined criteria**."

Korman does not remedy this deficiency of Kobori, nor does the Examiner allege that it does. Thus, the deficient disclosures of these references, considered either alone or in the combination suggested by the Examiner, fail to establish even a *prima facie* basis from which

28

a proper determination of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) can be made. Applicants submit that claims 63, 78, and 96 are patentably distinguishable over the cited references.

In addition, Korman does not disclose an "**embedded multimedia server within the printer** for selecting a portion of the monitored streaming media." The Examiner cites Korman's super computer as disclosing the claimed multimedia server. However, the super computer in Korman **does not reside in the printer**. Applicants have further clarified this point with the present amendments to the claims. Because the super computer does not reside in the printer, Korman does not disclose the claimed embedded multimedia server.

Kobori does not remedy this deficiency of Korman, nor does the Examiner alleges that it does. Thus, claims 63, 78, and 96 are patentably distinguishable over Kobori and Korman, alone or on combination, for this additional reason.

Claims 64-77, 79-95, and 97-101 variously depend from claims 63, 78, and 96, which were shown above to be patentable over Kobori and Korman and which recite additional features not shown in the cited references. For these reasons, Applicants submit that claims 64-77, 79-95, and 97-101 also are patentably distinguishable over Kobori and Korman.

For these dependent claims, the Examiner relies on Kobori and Korman in various combinations with, Reese, Hymel, Morinaga, Katsuo, Krumm, and/or Chino. None of the references remedy the above-stated deficiencies of Kobori and Korman, nor does the Examiner allege that they do. Rather, they are relied upon to show various limitations recited in the dependent claims. Thus, the dependent claims also are patentably distinguishable over Kobori and Korman in combination with Reese, Hymel, Morinaga, Katsuo, Krumm, and/or Chino.

29

For claims 72, 85, and 97, the Examiner further relies on Krumm. However, Krumm contains additional deficiencies for the limitations it is alleged to disclose. Specifically, Krumm is relied upon for the limitation "a user interface module for receiving user input to the printer indicating a participant speaker." The Examiner argues that step 200 in Fig. 2 of Krumm discloses the user interface module. However, nothing in step 200 discloses receiving user input **indicating a participant speaker**. The Examiner also relies on Krumm for "a content editing module for segmenting the streaming media content into a plurality of media clips." The Examiner cites step 206 in Fig. 2 of Krumm that discloses segmenting *an image*, not **streaming media content** into a plurality of media clips. Further, the Examiner relies upon Krumm for "a content selection module for selecting a media clip … based on the plurality of user defined criteria … comprising a **time period** when the participant speaker is the one or more speakers speaking in the recorded video meeting." The Examiner cites step 206 in Fig. 2 of Krumm for this limitation. However, the image in Krumm is not selected **based on a user defined criteria comprising a time period** when the participant speaker is…speaking…" Instead, Krumm at step 206 selects an image corresponding to a person if the image's histogram is adequately similar to a previously stored histogram.

Thus, claims 72, 85 and 97 are patentably distinguishable over Kobori, Korman, and Krumm for at least these additional reasons.

For claims 64, 91 and 99, the Examiner further relies on Reese in combination with Kobori and Krumm. However, Reese contains additional deficiencies for the limitations it is alleged to disclose. Specifically, Reese is relied upon for the limitation "a content processing module for extracting a Uniform Resource Locator from the document." The Examiner cites a generic JAVA execution environment in Reese and argues that the JAVA environment

30

discloses the above mentioned limitation. However, the generic JAVA environment does not disclose a content processing module that is **within a multimedia server embedded in a printer** that extracts a URL from a document. Thus claims 64, 91, 99, and their dependent claims, are patentably distinguishable over Kobori, Korman, and Reese for this additional reason.

Conclusion

Applicants respectfully submit that claims 63-101 as presented herein are patentably distinguishable over the cited references. Therefore, Applicants request reconsideration of the basis for the rejections to these claims and request allowance of them.

Applicants invite the Examiner to contact Applicants' representative at the number provided below if the Examiner believes it will help expedite furtherance of this application.

Respectfully submitted,
JONATHAN J. HULL, ET AL.

Dated: August 14, 2009   /Jennifer R. Bush/
                                              Jennifer R. Bush, Reg. No. 50,784
                                              Attorney for Assignee
                                              Fenwick & West LLP
                                              Silicon Valley Center
                                              801 California Street
                                              Mountain View, CA 94041
                                              Tel.: (650) 335-7213
                                              Fax: (650) 938-5200